

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application as currently amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated April 1, 2008, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 14-18 and 25-38. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 14-18 and 25-38 are currently pending and for at least the reasons stated below, the claims are allowable in view of the prior art of record.

Briefly, the subject application pertains to a method and apparatus for retrieving and storing the audio portion of a multimedia program. Specifically, a composite multimedia signal has an audio component and video signal. The composite multimedia signal is received by an input port of an apparatus for processing multimedia programs. The input port is further coupled to an extractor, in which the extractor receives the composite signal and extracts the audio component from the composite multimedia signal without extracting the video signal. Once the audio component is extracted from the composite signal, a processor of the apparatus receives the audio component to generate a processed audio signal. The processed audio signal is processed in a format that is sent to an output port and can be played on the digital audio player.

Objections to the specification

Claim 31 is objected to because claim 31 depends on cancelled claim 3. Claim 31 has been amended to depend on independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the objection be withdrawn and reconsideration of claim 31.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶ 2

Claim 11 is rejected for lack of antecedent basis for the limitation “said second output signal.” Claim 11 has been amended to recite “said processed audio_output signal.”

Claim 25 is rejected for lack of antecedent basis for the limitation “said second processed audio signal.” Claim 25 has been amended to recite “said processed audio signal.”

Claim 26 is rejected for lack of antecedent basis for the limitation “said second format includes a stereo.” Claim 26 has been amended to recite “wherein said multimedia program includes a multi-channel audio signal and said processed audio signal includes a stereo channel audio signal.”

Claims 11, 25 and 26 now provide proper antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn and reconsideration of claims 11, 25 and 26.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 6, 7, 17, 25-31, 35, 36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,174,512 (hereinafter “Martin”). Applicant(s) respectfully traverse and respectfully submit that the rejection is improper for at least the reasons discussed below.

Briefly, Martin discloses a portal for a communication system that includes a remote terminal, such as a set-top box (STB), connected via a communications network to a broadcast center. The portal includes a display connected to the remote terminal for displaying an arrangement of cells, each cell including a visual object and an underlying application. Specifically, Martin’s method and system includes an MPEG compressor 1020 that compresses a stream of digital signals and sends the signals to a multiplexor 1040. The multiplexor 1040 assembles a transport stream to send the compressed digital signals to a plurality of STBs. An STB 1140 receives the compressed digital signals in which the digital signal includes video signals and any corresponding audio signals (see e.g., Col. 5, Lines 42-54). The STB 1140 includes a demodulator 244 that receives the compressed digital signals and demodulates the received transmission (see e.g., Col. 7, Lines 51-55). The digital signals are demultiplexed and filtered into real time audio and video data which are then sent to a audio and video processor for output (see e.g., Col. 7, Lines 61-67; Col. 8, Lines 1-4).

Independent claims 1 and 17 recite, *inter alia*, "...an extractor coupled to said input port and adapted to selectively extract said audio component from said composite signal without extracting said video signal..."

Additionally, independent claim 28 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "...receiving said multimedia program composed of composite signals including said audio program component and a video component; selectively extracting from said multimedia program in response to commands from a user said audio component without extracting said video signal..."

The Examiner asserts that Martin anticipates claims 1, 6, 7, 17, 25-31, 35, 36 and 38. However, Applicant(s) respectfully disagree.

As disclosed in Martin, a compressed digital stream composed of video and audio signals is received by a STB 1040 (Col. 5, Lines 42-45). Once the STB 1040 receives the compressed digital stream, a demultiplexer 240 and demodulator 244 coupled to the STB 1040 demultiplexes and extracts real time audio and video data from the compressed digital stream (see e.g., Col. 7, Lines 61-66).

Contrary to Applicants invention of extracting the audio component without extracting the video component of a composite signal, Martin's demultiplexer 240 and demodulator 244 extracts the audio **and** video signals from a compressed digital stream. Martin requires the extraction of audio and video signals for sending the signals to their respective audio decoder 246 and video decoder 248. The decoder 246 and 248 converts the audio and video data and further sends the signals to an audio output and video output of STB 1040 for audio and visual output to a user (see e.g., Col. 7, Lines 66-67; Col. 8, Lines 1-4).

One of ordinary skill in the art would immediately recognize that demultiplexer 240 and demodulator 244 of Martin extracts both the audio and video signals of the above mentioned compressed digital stream. The rationale being that the audio decoder 246 and video decoder 248 converts the extracted audio and video signals for compatible playback on the STB 1040. Thus, Martin is silent with regards to selectively extracting the audio component from a composite signal without extracting the video signal as recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 28.

Therefore, claims 1, 17 and 28 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Additionally, claims 6, 7, 18, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30 31, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 38 depend on their respective base claims and are also allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 11, 14-16, 28, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue. Applicant(s) respectfully traverse and respectfully submit that the rejection is improper for at least the reasons discussed below.

Briefly, Inoue discloses a television broadcast receiving system for receiving television broadcasting signals such as digital satellite broadcasting service. Specifically, a user of the system may store content information after observing the information presented in the form of an image, voice or sound. A controlling portion 30 receives instructions from the user for recording content information. Thereafter, the controlling portion 30 records the content information in a vacant area of an external

memory element 100 that is connected to an external memory interface 45. The user of the system is then able store and read the information from the external memory through an interface circuit in the future (see e.g., Col. 17, Lines 56-67).

Independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "... an extractor responsive to said commands and adapted to receive said multimedia program and to selectively extract said audio component without extracting said video component from said multimedia program ..."

The Examiner asserts that Inoue anticipates claims 11, 14-16, 28, 33 and 34. However, Applicant(s) respectfully disagree.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Inoue is silent with regards to extracting the audio component of multimedia program without extracting the video component. Inoue discloses a demultiplexing section 132 that includes a packet ID filter (PID) 321. The PID filter 321 extracts MPEG-compressed video signals V and MPEG-compressed audio signals A of a broadcast television program selected by a user (see e.g., FIG. 3; Col. 7, Lines 35-55). Thus, Inoue is silent with regards selectively extracting the audio component without extracting the video component from a multimedia program as recited in independent claim 11.

Therefore, independent claim 11 is allowable for at least the reason discussed above. Additionally, claims 14, 15, 16, 33 and 34 depend on their respective base claim and are also allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the Applicants' undersigned representative to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Tiberiu Weisz', written in a cursive style.

Tiberiu Weisz
Reg. No. 29,876
GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
270 Madison Avenue, 8th Floor
(212) 684-3900

Date: July 25, 2008